COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
of the County of Los Angeles
2 Coral Circle • Monterey Park, CA 91755
323.890.7001 • TTY: 323.838.7449 • www.lacdc.org

Gloria Molina
Mark Ridley-Thomas
Zev Yaroslavsky
Don Knabe
Michael D. Antonovich
Commissioners

Cordé D. Carrillo
Acting Executive Director

February 17, 2009

Honorable Board of Commissioners
Community Development Commission of the
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Commissioners:

APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION OF HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM FUNDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANYON CREEK, A 75-UNIT AFFORDABLE SENIOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN CALABASAS (DISTRICT 3) (3 VOTE)

SUBJECT

This letter requests that your Board approve the allocation of HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds for Canyon Creek, a 75-unit senior housing development to be located at 4803 El Canon Avenue in the City of Calabasas.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Acting as a Responsible Agency for the Canyon Creek senior housing project, certify that the Community Development Commission has independently considered the attached Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), prepared by the City of Calabasas as Lead Agency, and reached its own conclusions regarding the environmental effects of the project; and find that the mitigation measures identified in the IS/MND are adequate to avoid or reduce potential environmental impacts to below significant levels.

2. Approve a loan to Thomas Safran & Associates (Developer) using HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds (HOME funds) in a total amount of up to $2,500,000 for the development of Canyon Creek, a 75-unit senior housing development (Project), which has been selected through a Notice

of Funding Availability jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Community Development Commission on April 9, 2008.

3. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to negotiate and execute a Loan Agreement with the Developer, for the purposes described above, and all related documents, including documents to subordinate the loan to permitted construction and permanent financing and any intergovernmental, interagency, or inter-creditor agreements necessary for the implementation of the development, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

4. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to execute amendments to the Loan Agreement and all related documents, as may be necessary for the implementation of the Project, following approval as to form by County Counsel.

5. Authorize the Acting Executive Director to incorporate, as needed, up to $2,500,000 in HOME funds into the Commission's approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 budget for the purposes described above.

PURPOSE /JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the recommended actions is to allocate HOME funds for the development of 75 units of affordable senior housing to be located at 4803 El Canon Avenue in the City of Calabasas and to approve environmental documentation for the Project.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

There is no impact on the County general fund.

The recommended loan consists of up to $2,500,000 in HOME funds for construction of the Project. Funds for the Project will be incorporated into the Commission's approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 budget on an as-needed basis.

The final loan amount will be determined following completion of negotiations with the Developer and arrangements with other involved lenders.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

HOME funds received from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development are administered by the Commission on behalf of the County and are used for affordable housing located in unincorporated areas and 47 participating cities.

On April 9, 2008, a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) was jointly issued by the Housing Authority and the Commission, making available approximately $11,900,000 in City of Industry Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside funds (Industry funds) and $2,500,000 in HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds (HOME funds) for the development of affordable rental housing.

On October 14, 2008, the Board of Commissioners of the Housing Authority approved seven projects requesting loans of Industry funds. Industry funds are administered by the Housing Authority, while HOME funds are administered by the Commission. At this time, it is recommended that your Board approve the allocation of HOME funds and environmental clearances for an eighth project, the Canyon Creek affordable senior housing development to be located at 4803 El Canon Avenue in the City of Calabasas.

The current funding recommendation will provide HOME funds to the Developer through a Loan Agreement with the Commission, to be executed by the Acting Executive Director following completion of negotiations and approval as to form by County Counsel. The recommendation has been made in accordance with the County's current Housing and Community Development Plan and the planning documents of other affected jurisdictions.

The Loan Agreement will incorporate affordability restrictions and provisions requiring the Developer to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws. The loan will be evidenced by a promissory note and secured by a deed of trust, with the term of affordability enforced by a recorded Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions document.

The Project consists of 75 units. Seventy-four are one-bedroom units and will be affordable to households with incomes that do not exceed 50% of the area median income, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan Statistical Area. One two-bedroom unit is provided for the on-site manager and has no affordability requirements. Affordability requirements for the development will remain in effect for 55 years. The development includes a 1,500 square foot community room.

Proposals submitted for the NOFA were reviewed by technical consultants and the Housing Authority/Commission's Independent Review Panel, which also reviews applicant appeals and administratively adjudicates each request. Applicants were notified of the scoring results and given seven days to appeal individual scores for procedural or technical errors.

The recommended funding award is based on threshold criteria, and only proposals scoring a minimum of 70% of the total points were considered for an award.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

As a Responsible Agency, and in accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the Commission reviewed the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared by the City of Calabasas and determined that the project will not have significant adverse impact on the environment. The Commission's consideration of the IS/MND and filing of the Notice of Determination satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as stated in Article 7, Section 15096.

The City of Calabasas approved the IS/MND for this project on January 3, 2008.

An Environmental Assessment was prepared for the project pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Based on the conclusions and findings of the Environmental Assessment, a Finding of No Significant Impact was approved by the Certifying Official of the Community Development Commission on December 17, 2008. Following the required public and agency comment period, HUD issued a Release of Funds for the project on January 2, 2009.

The environmental review record for this project is available for public review during regular business hours at the Commission's main office located at 2 Coral Circle in Monterey Park.

IMPACT ON CURRENT PROGRAM

The requested actions will increase the supply of affordable housing for low-income seniors in the County.

Respectfully submitted,

CORDÉ D. CARRILLO
Acting Executive Director

Attachments: 2

ATTACHMENT A

FUNDING DEMAND AND ALLOCATION

This is chart of the applications and award recommendations for HOME funds in the last NOFA round.

Non-Special Needs Housing Developments

TYPE	HOME DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Seniors	$2,500,000 1 Application *Canyon Creek*	$2,500,000 1 Development: *Canyon Creek*
Multi-Family	$2,900,000 1 Application *Avalon II Family Apartments*	
TOTAL	**$5,400,000** **2 Applications**	**$2,500,000** **1 Development**

Special Needs Housing

TYPE	HOME DEMAND	ALLOCATION
Homeless	$2,500,000 1 Application *Hope Gardens Family Center*	
TOTAL	**$2,500,000** **1 Application**	

ATTACHMENT B

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS

City of Calabasas

Safran Senior Affordable Housing Project

Final

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration

December 2007

Safran Senior Affordable Housing Project

Final
Initial Study/
Mitigated Negative Declaration

Prepared by:

City of Calabasas
Planning Division
26135 Mureau Road
Calabasas, CA 91302
Contact: Talyn Mirzakhanian, Planner

Prepared with the assistance of:

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
790 East Santa Clara Street
Ventura, California 93001

December 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

Appendices

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title: Safran Senior Affordable Housing Project

Lead Agency: City of Calabasas
26135 Mureau Road
Calabasas, California 91302
Phone: (818) 878-4225/Fax: (818) 878-4205

Contact Person: Talyn Mirzakhanian, Planner

Project Location: The project site, Assessor's Parcel Number 2068-004-016, is located in the City of Calabasas within western Los Angeles County, California. The site encompasses approximately 0.968 acres on a single parcel at 4803 El Canon Avenue, south of Calabasas Road near Old Town Calabasas. Figure 1 shows the location of the project site within the greater Los Angeles region. Figure 2 shows the location of the project site within the City of Calabasas. Figure 3 shows photos of the existing site conditions. Figure 4 shows photos of surrounding land uses.

Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Thomas Safran & Associates
11812 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, California 90049

Existing Land Use: Currently, the project site is developed with one abandoned primary residential structure and two accessory structures that appear to have been secondary residential structures, or guest houses, as well as a few storage/shed structures. The remainder of the site is generally covered with vegetation, a driveway, an empty above-ground pool, and some fencing. Photos of the site can be seen on Figure 3.

General Plan and Zoning: The project site is zoned Commercial, Old Town (CT) and designated in the General Plan as Business – Old Town (B-OT).

Surrounding Land Uses: The project site is bordered on the east by El Canon Avenue, across which is the Motion Picture and Television Hospital complex. The project site is bordered on the west by Calabasas Creek, across which are two- to three-story multi-family residences. Immediately south of the project site are three-story multi-family residences. To the north is a Las Virgenes Municipal Water District sewage lift station, and commercial retail and restaurant development. Photos of surrounding land uses can be seen on Figure 4.

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The proposed project involves the construction of 75 units of affordable senior housing on a 42,176 square foot (0.96 acres) parcel at 4803 El Canon Avenue in the City of Calabasas. Project development would include the construction of two, three-story buildings. The proposed site plan can be seen in Figure 5 and the ground floor plan is shown in Figure 6. The buildings would be connected by a network of landscaped walkways, as shown in Figure 6, with a subterranean parking garage providing 74 standard spaces, two handicapped spaces, including one van accessible space, and 83 bicycle spaces situated beneath the development. See Figure 7 for garage plan. As shown in Table 1, of the 75 senior dwelling units proposed, 74 would be one bedroom units ranging from approximately 550 square feet to approximately 650 square feet. One unit would have two bedrooms and approximately 1,124 square feet, and is intended to house the onsite complex manager.

Table 1
Proposed Units Characteristics

Unit Type	Proposed Number of Units By Type	Number of Bedrooms per Unit	Size (square feet)
A	44	1	560
B	28	1	550
C	2	1	650
D*	1	2	1,124

Source: John Cotton FAIA Architects, 7-31-2007
**Manager's Unit*

Upon completion of construction, the footprint of the residential structures would cover approximately 20,509 square feet and the driveway would cover an additional 363 square feet. Thus, total site coverage would be approximately 20,872 square feet, or about 53% of the site. Total proposed residential building area would be approximately 52,825 square feet.

The proposed project would require the demolition of one existing primary residential structure and two accessory structures that appear to have been used as secondary residential structures, as well as the removal of multiple storage sheds, some fencing and an above ground pool. Demolition would be followed by site grading and excavation for the subterranean parking garage and building foundations.

In accordance with Chapter 17.22 of the Calabasas Municipal Code, by proposing affordable senior housing, the applicant is eligible for a density bonus to allow a 35% density increase over the 1.0 maximum floor-to-area ratio (FAR) otherwise allowed by the Code. Thus, the allowable FAR would be 1.35. Further, the applicant is requesting approval of the following exceptions to the Code in accordance with State Bill 1818:

- *Increase slope on subterranean garage ramp to 20% (8% max allowed by code)*
- *Decrease pervious surface provided to 22% (28% required by code)*

- *Decrease in common open space provided to 21, 304 square feet (30,000 square feet required by code) and private open space to 60 square feet/unit (150 square feet/2 bedroom and 75 square feet/1 bedroom required by code).*

PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL MAY BE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT ACTION:

None. The City of Calabasas is the only agency with discretionary approval authority over the proposed project. However, the project is of particular interest to the adjacent jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles because of property within their jurisdiction with street frontage on El Canon Ave. Although the City of LA has no discretionary approval authority over the proposed project, they will review this environmental document.

General Plan Consistency Review

Applicable General Plan Policies	Consistency Analysis	Consistent/Not Consistent
General Plan Consistency Review Program		
Air Quality		
1. Because multi-family densities can support transit, multi-family developments should be located along primary roadways, ideally within 1/8 mile of an existing or potential future transit stop.	The proposed project would be located on El Canon avenue in the Old Town Calabasas area. The Calabasas Trolley provides service to the Old Town area, and stops approximately 0.08 miles from the project site on Calabasas Road.	Consistent
Resource Performance Standards		
1. To meet the City's overall water conservation performance objective, projects will be reviewed to assess their compliance with the following: • Incorporation of drought tolerant and low water using plants; maximize preservation of natural vegetation • Incorporation of water conservation techniques into the design of the irrigation system through such techniques as mulching, installation of drip irrigation systems, landscape design to group plants of similar water demand, rain sensors and automatic irrigation systems. • Clustering of landscaped areas to maximize the efficiency of the irrigation system, design of irrigation systems to eliminate watering of impervious surfaces. • Installation of water conserving kitchen and bathroom fixtures and appliances, installation of thermostatically controlled mixing valves for baths and showers, and insulation of hot water lines. • As part of developments subject to Water Resources Performance Standards, proposed development projects shall prepare a "Runoff Mitigation Plan" that illustrates Best Management Practices that will be employed to prevent pollutants and sediments from running off the built project. The plan shall be designed to ensure that no new sediments or pollutants will wash off the site during rainfall event. If the project site is over 5 acres in size, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan as prepared for the NPDES may be acceptable to	Mitigation Measure UTL-1 in the *Utilities and Service Systems* section, along with standard water quality measures in the *Hydrology and Water Quality* section of the Initial Study would require compliance with the City's water conservation performance objective and prevent pollutants and sediment from entering the watershed	Consistent by virtue of the state density bonus statute

General Plan Consistency Review

Applicable General Plan Policies	Consistency Analysis	Consistent/Not Consistent
the City in place of the Runoff Mitigation Plan. • To slow runoff and maximize infiltration, at least seventy (28%) percent of the proposed development site must either be landscaped or constructed with pervious paving materials. • Swales, berms, green filter strips, infiltration pits, and/or sediment traps shall be provided, where feasible, as part of site stormwater runoff management systems to slow runoff and direct runoff to permeable or landscaped areas, thereby reducing pollutant loading in area waterways.		
Erosion Control Performance Standards		
1. Concurrent with submittal of a grading plan, submittal of water erosion and dust control plans to the city are required. Erosion control plans will be reviewed concurrently with the grading plan. • Erosion control plans shall be prepared and shall cover all areas impacted by proposed grading. • The erosion control plans shall address methods of control (e.g., detention basins, check dams, sandbagging), and interim storm drain construction if required. • Grading plans shall include appropriate and feasible measures to minimize dust. • Erosion control measures shall be in place prior to the rainy season. • Erosion control measures shall be implemented as soon as grading operations commence, and shall remain in operation until improvement construction has begun within the controlled area.	Recommendations in the Geotechnical Report, standard City-required grading techniques, and construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce impacts associated with dust and erosion to a less than significant level	Consistent
2. New development should balance onsite cut and fill, so as to minimize the transporting of soils on- or off-site.	Onsite cut and fill material are balanced to the maximum extent feasible.	Consistent
3. The physical extent of graded areas shall be minimized. Cleared areas are to be landscaped with temporary groundcover as soon as it is feasible after grading. Such measures are to remain in place until permanent landscaping can be	Standard City-required grading permits, techniques and construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) would minimize grading and implement erosion control measures.	Consistent

General Plan Consistency Review

Applicable General Plan Policies	Consistency Analysis	Consistent/Not Consistent
installed.		
Solid Waste Management		
1. All new development projects within Calabasas are to be consistent with the provisions of the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.	As discussed under the *Utilities and Service Systems* section, the proposed project would comply with the applicable requirements of the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.	Consistent
Seismic and Geologic Hazards		
1. The design of all new structures shall comply with the latest International Building Code seismic design standards, as well as such supplemental design criteria that the City may adopt to ensure that buildings are designed so as to avoid structural collapse.	A site/project specific geotechnical study was conducted and submitted to the City for review and approval. Recommendations within the geotechnical report shall be implemented to ensure that buildings are designed so as to avoid structural collapse	Consistent
Stormwater Management and Flooding		
1. The incremental increase in stormwater runoff that will be created by a proposed development is to be retained or detained onsite unless adequate discharge downstream capacity is available	As discussed in the *Water Quality and Hydrology* section of the initial study, the proposed project design would include detention and infiltration on site of all increased runoff.	Consistent
Fire Hazard Management Performance Standards		
1. Roadways and internal circulation systems shall be designed to accommodate fire suppression equipment with adequate turn-around areas as determined by the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Districts. Where necessary, existing fire hydrants are to be tested to confirm adequate fire flows	Site plans and building plans would be submitted to the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Districts for review.	Consistent
2. Fire hydrants are to be provided as required by the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Districts, as shall "blue dots" to identify fire hydrants.	Site plans and building plans would be submitted to the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Districts for review.	Consistent
3. Proposals for new development will be referred to the Los Angeles Consolidated Fire Districts to determine projected response times to the project site to provide appropriate fire hazard management recommendations for inclusion by the City as project conditions of approval.	Site plans and building plans would be submitted to the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Districts for review.	Consistent

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is "Potentially Significant" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

■ Aesthetics	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	■ Transportation/Traffic
■ Biological Resources	☐ Energy and Mineral Resources	■ Utilities and Service Systems
■ Cultural Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
■ Geology and Soils	☐ Population and Housing	

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

■ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Thomas W. Bartlett

Tom Bartlett
City of Calabasas
City Planner

10-29-07
Date

Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. **AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	■	☐	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	■	☐

a. The project site is located in the urbanized Old Town Calabasas area, on a relatively flat site currently developed with residential buildings. No panoramic scenic vistas exist from, through or to the site. The surrounding trees and development, including the three-story multi-family residential structures immediately adjacent to the site, inhibit views of the regional hillsides. Existing views are already restricted by the presence of structures and large trees. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas as a result of the project would be **less than significant.**

b, c. There is no state scenic highway within the vicinity of the project site. However, native oak trees play a significant role in the Calabasas landscape (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 1995). Section 17.26.070 of the City of Calabasas Municipal Code requires that an Oak Tree Permit be obtained for the alteration of any healthy oak tree greater than 2 inches in diameter. According to the Oak Tree Survey performed by LSA Associates, Inc. and dated October 4, 2007, 14 coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees are currently located on the project site, seven of which would need to be removed to accommodate the proposed project, one of which has a diameter of less than two inches and therefore does not require a permit. An Oak Tree Permit would be required for the removal of the other six oak trees.

The removal of six native oak trees would damage the onsite visual resources and would degrade the existing visual character of the site afforded by the presence of healthy mature native oak trees. Therefore, impacts relating to the existing visual character of the site and onsite scenic resources would be **potentially significant.** Recommendations made by LSA Associates and the City Oak Tree Consultant, along with Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-13 would reduce potential impacts to oak trees to a less than significant level.

The project site is located in the Old Town Calabasas area, for which a Master Plan and Design Guidelines (1994) have been adopted. The design guidelines contain goals and policies intended to facilitate development and redevelopment that would preserve and enhance the "Old West" character and style of the Old Town region. Policies pertaining to architectural elements, site planning, signage, landscaping, and utility placement are applicable to any proposed development within the master plan area. As shown in the proposed elevations on Figure 8, the design of the proposed project incorporates the "early western" architectural theme as outlined in the guidelines. This includes varying the wall planes with the use of balconies, canopies and overhangs, as well as facades using traditional base, body and cap functions with typical Old West style articulation and materials. The design also includes the use of wood framed doors and windows, as well as wood siding in the traditional old west style. The proposed project would include landscaping around the entire property, as well as siting one building so it abuts the front property line as detailed in the guidelines.

The removal of vacant single-family residential structures and subsequent construction of senior apartments onsite would alter the existing visual character of the site; however, adherence to the policies within the Old Town Master Plan and Design Guidelines (1994) would ensure compatibility with the site surroundings. Policies include but are not limited to: arranging plants in groups and spacing so as to allow them to develop into massings, plants shall compliment and soften structural edges of buildings, and all landscaped areas shall be maintained to ensure proper plant health, growth and appearance. Adherence to the policies and guidelines contained within the Old Town Master Plan would ensure the alteration of the existing visual character would result in a **less than significant impact.**

d. The proposed project would introduce new lighting where some currently exists. The onsite residential development included indoor and outdoor lighting, also street lights on El Canon Avenue as well the surrounding commercial and residential development all produce light that can be observed onsite. Furthermore, any onsite lighting proposed in association with the project would be subject to the requirements of the City of Calabasas Dark Skies and Lighting Ordinance (Municipal Code §17.27). Therefore, impacts associated with lighting would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-13, would reduce impacts to visual resources to a less than significant level.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-13 would reduce impacts to aesthetic resources to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (2002), the project site is designated as Other Land, and is not designated as prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, **no impact** to important farmland would occur.

b. The project area is not zoned for agricultural use; the project area is zoned as Commercial - Old Town (C-T). The Williamson Act does not apply to the project site and **no impact** would occur.

c. No farming activity occurs at or adjacent to the site. Therefore, **no impact** related to the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:				
net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	■

The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The South Coast Air Basin is currently in non-attainment status of state regulatory standards for ozone (O_3) and fine particulate matter (PM_{10}), and is currently designated as a non-attainment area for federal regulatory standards for O_3, PM_{10}, and carbon monoxide (CO). A project's impact to air quality is significant if it exceeds any of the thresholds for criteria pollutants shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Air Quality Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
NO_x	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM_{10}	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
$PM_{2.5}$	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
SO_x	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day
Lead	3 lbs/day	3 lbs/day

Source SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993

a. The proposed project involves the development of two buildings containing 75 senior housing units and a subterranean garage. In 2005 there were an estimated 7,593 households in the City of Calabasas and the estimated number of households in 2010 is 8,043 (Southern California Association of Governments, 2007). The 75 proposed affordable housing units would account for approximately 15% of the estimated increase in households from 2005 to 2010. The increase in the City's population as a result of the proposed project would not exceed

population forecasts of the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the City of Calabasas. Therefore, **no impact** would occur with respect to regional air quality management plans.

b, c. Project implementation would generate temporary air pollutant emissions during construction and long-term emissions due to vehicle traffic and energy use. Each of these is discussed below.

Construction Emissions. Construction vehicles and equipment traveling along unpaved roads, grading, trenching, and stockpiled soils have the potential to generate fugitive dust (PM_{10}) through the exposure of soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment. In addition, exhaust emissions associated with heavy construction equipment would potentially degrade air quality. PM_{10} and exhaust emissions associated with construction activities are considered temporary air quality impacts.

Temporary construction emissions were estimated using the URBEMIS 2002 v.9.2.2 computer model (see Appendix A for air quality data). The number and type of equipment to be used during construction were estimated based on URBEMIS default amounts for similar construction projects. During project site preparation and excavation, the soils that underlie portions of the site would be turned over and pushed around, exposing the soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment by onsite operating equipment. The majority of emissions associated with construction activities on site come from off-road vehicles such as cranes and backhoes, but some emissions are also associated with construction worker trips and the application of architectural coatings, which release volatile or reactive organic gases (ROG) during the drying phase. Table 3 shows the estimated maximum daily construction emissions.

Table 3
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions
(pounds per day)

Emission Source	ROG	NO_x	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Grading	3.94	35.89	17.83	76.42	16.97
Building	49.67	25.07	26.60	1.98	1.80
Threshold (peak day)	*75*	*100*	*550*	*150*	*55*

Note: Grading and building do not occur simultaneously
Source: URBEMIS 2002 v.9.2.2. See Appendix A for modeling results

As indicated in Table 3, construction emissions are below SCAQMD thresholds (grading and building construction do not occur simultaneously, but rather in separate phases) for ROG, NOx, CO, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Rule 403 of the SCAQMD Handbook requires minimization of particulate emissions for all dust generating activity during construction. Therefore, although construction emissions are below SCAQMD thresholds, construction activity would need to be performed in conformance with the requirements of Rule 403.

Operational Emissions. Long-term emissions associated with the proposed project, were estimated using the California Air Resources Board's (ARB's) URBEMIS 2002 v.9.2.2 computer model Operational emissions were determined based on the proposed 75 affordable housing units. Project emissions estimates as determined in the modeling analysis are presented in Table 4. Mobile emissions are those associated with vehicle trips, while the use of natural gas and landscaping maintenance equipment are included in the area emissions.

Table 4
Operational Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (lbs/day)				
	ROG	NO_x	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Mobile Emissions	3.24	3.90	33.35	4.58	0.91
Area Emissions	4.97	1.27	5.60	0.01	0.01
Total	**8.21**	**5.17**	**38.95**	**4.59**	**0.92**
SCAQMD Thresholds	*55*	*55*	*550*	*150*	*55*

Source: URBEMIS 2002 v 8.7 (See Appendix A for model assumptions and results)

As shown, the emissions generated by the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's daily operational thresholds for any pollutant and would not significantly affect regional air quality. Thus, the project's long-term impact to regional air quality would be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

d. Certain population groups are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others. Children, the elderly and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases, are particularly vulnerable. Sensitive land uses include those locations where such individuals are concentrated, such as hospitals, schools, and residences. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site include the private residences located approximately 25 feet south and west of the site boundary and a hospital approximately 100 feet east of the site boundary. However, as shown in Table 4, the emissions generated by the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's daily operational thresholds for any pollutant. Therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be **less than significant**.

e. The proposed project would be used for residential purposes and would not generate objectionable odors. **No impact** related to odors would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Have a substantial effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	■	☐	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	■	☐

LSA Associates, Inc. completed a biological resource assessment and an oak tree report for the project site on September 22, 2006, and July 10, 2007 (updated October 4, 2007), respectively. These reports are incorporated by reference and included in their entirety in Appendix B.

a, d. The project site encompasses an area of approximately 42,176 square feet (0.96 acres). The proposed development would cover approximately 20,872 sf, or 53% of the project site. The remainder would be open space. The project site is not located in a designated environmentally sensitive area and is not known to serve as a wildlife corridor (Calabasas Environmentally Sensitive Areas Map, 2005). Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially impede the movement of wildlife in the area. LSA Associates, Inc concluded that no candidate or protected species are known to be present on the project site. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

b, c. The project site is not located in an area containing sensitive biological resources (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 1995) and is not subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan. Neither riparian habitat nor wetlands would be adversely affected as a result of project development. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

e. As discussed in Section I, *Aesthetics*, native oak trees play a significant role in the Calabasas landscape (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 1995). Section 17.26.070 of the City of Calabasas Municipal Code requires that an Oak Tree Permit be obtained for the alteration of any healthy oak tree greater than 2 inches in diameter. According to the Oak Tree Report performed by LSA (dated July 10, 2007), approximately 14 coast live oak trees were inventoried and evaluated onsite (see Appendix B for report and photographs of trees). All the oak trees were determined to be healthy specimens. Seven of the oak trees are growing along a perennial drainage (Calabasas Creek) at the sites western boundary and may be considered oak riparian habitat by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Current project design would not affect the trees along Calabasas Creek. However, based upon the current site plan, six of the oak trees onsite would be removed for the construction and development of the proposed project, for which an oak tree permit would be required. Therefore, the removal of the trees would be a **significant impact**.

f. Please see discussion under items b and c.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following mitigation measures in conjunction with the requirements of an oak tree permit would reduce impacts to locally protected native oak trees to a less than significant level.

BIO-1 **Oak Tree Permit Conditions.** The City's oak tree permit conditions require that a mitigation program be developed for proposed impacts. Several options are available to offset the loss of oak tree inventory on the site. A loss in oak tree inventory on the site shall be described in terms of species, total inches of diameter aggregate loss, and the magnitude of the impacts. The City may attach the following conditions, or a combination thereof, on an oak tree permit that may include the following:

- A cash fee paid to the oak tree mitigation fund, which shall include maintenance and monitoring costs. The determination of the dollar value, cost or loss shall be calculated in accordance with the most current mitigation schedule established by the City Council. The Council shall

review and approve such fees at least once every three years. The City may accept appropriate dedication of land in lieu of cash.

- One inch of oak tree diameter shall be planted for each inch of tree removed. Locations appropriate for new replacement plantings may be proposed by the applicant and approved by the City arborist prior to the granting of a permit based on the potential for long-term viability.
- Replacement or placement of additional oak trees, associated hardwood canopy, land, or wildlife habitat to proportionally offset the impacts associated with the loss of oak trees, limbs, roots, or potential long-term adverse impacts due to alterations or encroachment within the protected zone. Locations appropriate to such new plantings may be proposed by the applicant and must be approved by City staff prior to the granting of a permit based on the potential for long-term viability.
- Relocation of oak trees over 10 inches in diameter shall not be considered as mitigation.
- Restrictions on construction activities within the protected zone of oak trees.
- Remedial maintenance programs to improve the health of existing oak trees.
- Monitoring shall be conducted during all grading and construction activities at intervals warranted by the site conditions and level of activity. The monitoring program shall consist of quantitative and qualitative observations useful in identifying stress-related responses of oak trees. Monitoring activities shall be performed in accordance with the procedures adopted in the guidelines. Following construction, annual monitoring shall be performed for a minimum of five years as warranted by site conditions, to ensure continued health of the trees and habitat areas. A City-qualified arborist shall conduct all monitoring. Costs shall be borne by the applicant. Restitution or remediation shall be required, should a project fail to comply with the desired establishment goals. Information provided by monitoring shall be used in establishing realistic mitigation measures and to ensure the future of oak resources throughout the City. Criteria for evaluating the success of oak tree preservation and establishing associated vegetation shall be specified in the permit conditions. Remediation shall be required as necessary to enable a site to meet the establishment criteria.
- Registration. All replacement oak trees shall be registered with the City in accordance with the guidelines.
- Maintenance. All oak trees shall be maintained in accordance with the guidelines.
- Bond. The City may require adequate security to ensure performance, correct construction procedures, reforestation, monitoring and maintenance, in an amount to be determined by the City.
- Recordation. As deemed necessary by the City or as set forth in the City's Municipal Code, conditions of approval for an oak tree permit shall be recorded. The specific wording of the recorded permit shall be subject to the approval of the director.

BIO-2 **Retained Oak Trees.** For any oak tree whose removal can be avoided, the following guidelines shall be followed to avoid impacts to the retained oak trees:

- No construction activities or placement of structures shall occur within the protected zone of any retained oak tree.
- Landscaping, trenching or irrigation systems shall not be installed within the oak tree protected zone.
- Activities that cause excessive compaction within the protected zone shall not be permitted.
- Manufactured cut slopes shall not begin their downward cut within the protected zone.
- Manufactured fill slopes shall not extend within the protected zone.
- On-slope retaining structures, if required, shall be designed to protect the root system of retained oak trees by preserving the natural grade within the protected zone.
- Sedimentation and siltation shall be controlled to avoid filling around bases of oak trees.
- Construction fence shall be erected along the protected zone of retained oak trees to prevent encroachment into the protected area.

BIO-3 **Monitoring Removed Oak Trees.** Monitoring activities for removal of oak trees shall consist of the following:

- The applicant shall provide verification of the location of each tree that is proposed for removal.
- All oak trees designated to be removed shall be flagged prior to removal, and located using a hand held tape measure. Measuring along the south property line with off sets to the north With the verified location of each tree, status shall be rechecked (i.e. remove, save, etc).
- All oak tree removal shall be verified to check for damage to any retained oak trees growing close association to the removed tree.
- Mitigation may be required for damage to any retained oak tree.

BIO-4 **Mitigation Planting.** The impacts to any oak trees as a result of this project shall be mitigated by planting container-grown oak trees. To the greatest extent practicable, replacement trees will be planted on site. The balance of the replacement trees will be planted within the City. The proper planting locations should be determined by a qualified arborist or landscape contractor. Irrigation for the planted oak trees should be available for the first two to three years to increase the survival rate. The planted trees should be monitored for soil moisture level, pest/disease infestation, and herbivory.

BIO-5 **Ivy Removal.** All ivy should be removed from retained trees by a qualified landscape contractor. Ivy removal must be done carefully, taking great care to avoid damaging oak bark or branches. Use of a selective herbicide may be possible; a qualified pest control advisor should be consulted regarding any pesticide.

BIO-6 **Notice.** The applicant shall provide a forty-eight (48) hour notice to the City and the applicant's oak tree consultant prior to the start of any approved work within the protected zone of any oak tree.

BIO-7 **Protected Zone Fencing.** Prior to start of construction, all oak trees shall be fenced at the edge of the protected zone to the extent possible in accordance with the Oak Tree Preservation and Protection Guidelines.

BIO-8 **Qualified Arborist.** All approved pruning shall be performed by a qualified arborist under the direction of the applicant's oak tree consultant. The arborist shall use the Pruning ANSI A300 Standards adopted by the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture. The same arborist shall, at the direction of the City Arborist, remove the ivy that is growing into the branch structure of the oaks as identified in BIO-5.

BIO-9 **Protected Zone.** All approved excavation within the protected zone of any oak tree shall be performed with hand tools under the direction of the applicant's oak tree consultant. No construction materials, debris or vehicles shall be stored within the protected zone of any oak tree at any time.

BIO-10 **Irrigation and Drainage.** Unless specifically approved by the City, no planting or irrigation shall be placed within the protected zone of any oak tree. All future drainage shall be directed away from the drip line of oak trees. The area beneath the drip lines shall remain dry at all times.

BIO-11 **Mulch.** At the completion of construction, the applicant shall place three inches (3") of an approved mulch throughout the drip line of each oak tree.

BIO-12 **Written Certification.** Within ten (10) days of the completion of work, the applicant's oak tree consultant shall submit written certification to the Planning Division. This certification shall describe all work performed and whether such work was performed in accordance with the mitigation measures and permit conditions required.

BIO-13 **Removal and Replacement.** All oak removal shall be replaced on an inch for inch basis with at least 50% of the replacement trees of the species *Quercus lobata* (Valley Oak). The oak tree consultant shall be on-site and monitoring the removal of any oak trees. Further, they should be present whenever any work is performed with the protected zone of any oak tree.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce impacts to protected native oak trees to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	■	☐	☐

a. ~~The project site is currently developed with one abandoned primary residential structure and~~ two accessory structures which appear to have been secondary residential structures, or guest houses, as well as a few storage shed structures, an above ground pool, a driveway, some fencing and vegetation. Historical aerial photographs indicate the structures were developed between the 1940's and the 1970's (California Environmental, 2006). The structures are currently dilapidated and in poor condition, and do not represent any known historical figures or events. There are no known historical resources on the project site or in the site vicinity. No **impact** would occur.

b. Ground disturbance within the project area would involve grading and excavation. No cultural resources are known to exist within the project area and the project site is not within an area of potential archaeological sensitivity (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 2003). However, as with any ground-disturbing activity, project grading and excavation would have the potential to adversely affect undiscovered cultural resources and impacts could be **potentially significant**.

c. Construction of the proposed project would result in no impacts, either directly or indirectly, to a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic features because none are known to exist at the project site. **No impact** would occur.

d. As discussed above, development of the proposed project would involve grading and excavation. Such activities would have the potential to adversely affect undiscovered human remains. Impacts would be **potentially significant.**

Mitigation Measures

The following measures would reduce impacts relating to the possible discovery of as yet undetected cultural and human remains during grading to a less than significant level.

CR-1 **Resource Recovery Procedures.** If unanticipated cultural resource remains are encountered during construction or land modification activities, the developer shall follow the applicable procedures established by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation concerning protection and preservation of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR 8700). In this event, the developer/construction contractor shall cease work until the nature, extent, and possible significance of any cultural remains can be assessed and, if necessary, remediated. Such assessment and remediation shall be implemented by the developer and shall be subject to review and approval by the Deputy Director/City Planner prior to commencement with onsite construction/grading activities. If remediation is needed, possible techniques include removal, documentation, or avoidance of the resource, depending upon the nature of the find.

CR-2 **Human Remains Recovery Procedures.** In the event that human remains are discovered during construction or land modification activities, the developer shall follow the procedures in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. These procedures require notification of the County coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission if the coroner determines the remains to be those of Native American ancestry. Onsite construction/grading shall not commence until evidence has been presented to the City manager that the developer has adhered to these procedures.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2 would reduce impacts to unknown cultural resources and human remains to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	☐	☐	■	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	■	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure,				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
including liquefaction?	☐	■	☐	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	■	☐	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	■	☐	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	■

A Geotechnical Engineering Investigation was prepared for the site by Geotechnologies, Inc. The report, dated October 4, 2006, was used in part for analysis of the project's impacts related to Geology and Soils. The report is contained in Appendix C.

a(i-ii) The project site does not lie within an Earthquake Fault Studies Zone and is not known to be underlain by active or potentially active faults. The potential for substantial adverse effects related to fault rupture is low. Like most of Southern California, the proximity of active faults is such that the site has experienced and will continue to experience strong seismically induced ground motion. However, development would be subject to the International Building Code (IBC) as referenced by the California Building Code (CBC)with Los Angeles amendments, and would be required to adhere to recommendations in the approved site-specific soils and geotechnical engineering reports (as appropriate). As such, the design and construction of new structures would be engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration and seismic shaking that may occur onsite. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

a(iii). Liquefaction describes the phenomenon in which ground shaking works cohesionless soil particles into a tighter packing which induces excess pore pressure. These soils may acquire a high degree of mobility that can lead to structurally damaging deformations. Liquefaction begins below the water table, but after liquefaction has developed, the groundwater table rises and causes the overlying soil to mobilize. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where the groundwater is less than 50 feet from the surface and where the soils are composed of poorly

consolidated fine to medium sand According to the geotechnical study prepared for the proposed project, groundwater was encountered during soil exploration at depths of approximately 13 to 14 feet. Therefore, liquefaction hazards would be **potentially significant.**

(iv). The geologic character of an area determines its potential for landslides. Steep slopes, the extent of erosion, and the rock composition of a hillside all contribute to the potential for slope failure and landslide events In order to fail, unstable slopes need to be disturbed. Common triggering mechanisms of slope failure include undercutting slopes by erosion or grading, saturation of marginally stable slopes by rainfall or irrigation, and shaking of marginally stable slopes during earthquakes. The probability of seismically-induced landslides affecting the proposed development is considered remote due to the relatively flat nature of the project site and surrounding areas. In addition, the project site is not located within a State of California Seismic Hazard Zone for landslides. Therefore, impacts relating to landslide hazards would be **less than significant**.

b. The project site is underlain by the Modelo Formation bedrock. Artificial fill occurs throughout the site at depths between 2 and 7 feet below the site grade from previous earthwork. The artificial fill typically consists of silty sand to silty clay. Native alluvial soils occur beneath the artificial fill material. The native soils range from silty clay to clayey silt. The bedrock and native soils encountered are typical within this area of Calabasas.

Construction activities would include the excavation and grading of the site, which would cause the disruption and displacement of onsite soils Although the potential for onsite erosion is not high, construction activities could result in increased erosion and offsite sedimentation. Implementation of all appropriate recommendations in the approved Geotechnical Reports, standard City-required erosion control techniques and construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce soil erosion effects to a **less than significant** level.

c. As previously discussed, the project site is not located in an area susceptible to landslides. However, liquefaction and lateral spreading could occur. Impacts related to liquefaction and lateral spreading would be **potentially significant.**

d. Expansive soils expand or swell when wetted, and contract or shrink when dried. Expansive soils can cause damage to structure foundations. A representative sample of onsite soils was found to be in the moderately expansive range Therefore, impacts relating to expansive soils would be **potentially significant**

e. The proposed project would utilize connection to the City sewer system. A septic system would not be installed in association with the proposed project **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 would reduce impacts relating to liquefaction, lateral spreading and expansive soils to a less than significant level.

GEO-1 **Ground Improvement.** Ground improvement shall be determined by a specialty firm in order to mitigate the potential for liquefaction and lateral

spreading and to densify the soils for the support of the building foundation(s).

Suitable measures to reduce impacts from liquefaction and lateral spreading could include one or more of the following techniques, as determined by a qualified geotechnical engineer:

- *Specialized design of foundations by a structural engineer;*
- *Removal or treatment of liquefiable soils to reduce the potential for liquefaction;*
- *Drainage to lower the groundwater table to below the level of liquefiable soil;*
- *In-situ densification of soils or other alterations to the ground characteristics; or*
- *Other alterations to the ground characteristics.*

Suitable measures to reduce impacts from expansive soils could include one or more of the following techniques, as determined by a qualified geotechnical engineer:

- *Excavation of existing soils and importation of non-expansive soils, and*
- *Foundation design to accommodate certain amounts of differential expansion such as posttensional slab and/or ribbed foundations designed in accordance with Chapter 18, Division III of the UBC.*

The following measures shall be preformed by the firm that oversees ground improvement work:

- *The Geotechnical Engineer shall review the plans and specifications for the proposed ground improvement method.*
- *After review of the proposed ground improvement plans and specifications, the Geotechnical Engineer shall prepare a supplemental report indicating their concurrence with the proposed ground improvement plans and specifications. The report shall also provide quality control and quality assurance criteria to provide a means of confirming that mitigation of the potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading and soil densification has been accomplished.*
- *A representative of the Geotechnical Engineer shall monitor and document the construction/installation of the ground improvement components.*
- *After completion of the ground improvement work, testing shall be preformed under the direction of the Geotechnical Engineer, as appropriate, to confirm the suitability of the ground improvement(s) performed.*
- *The Geotechnical Engineer shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the post-ground improvement testing. The report shall include a statement that the ground improvement has mitigated the potential for liquefaction and later spreading at the site and will provide suitable support for foundations*

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts related to liquefaction, lateral spreading and expansive soils to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	■
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area?	☐	☐	☐	■
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death	☐	☐	■	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

VII. **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** - Would the project:

involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

The following hazards and hazardous materials analysis is based upon an Environmental Site Assessment conducted by California Environmental Geologists and Engineers, Inc. in April 2006; a pre-demolition asbestos survey conducted by Gale/Jordan Associates, Inc. in September 2006; and a lead-containing materials survey conducted by Gale/Jordan Associates, Inc. in October 2006. All three of these reports are included in Appendix D.

a. The proposed project involves the development of two buildings containing 75 senior housing units and a subterranean garage. The project would not involve the storage, use, or disposal of any hazardous substances or materials. The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from such. **No impact** related to the use, storage, transportation, storage or emissions of hazardous materials would occur.

b. Development of the proposed project would require the demolition of all onsite structures. The existing onsite structures were constructed during the 1930s and 1970s. In the pre-demolition asbestos survey conducted by Gale/Jordan, Inc., fourteen materials were identified as asbestos-containing materials (ACM): wall plaster, ceiling tiles, flooring materials, cement board and pipe, drywall and roofing materials. All ACM have the potential to release asbestos fibers into the air if they are disturbed or damaged. In addition, hazardous lead-based paint was encountered during Gale/Jordan, Inc.'s lead-paint survey. Therefore, demolition activities could expose workers to asbestos and lead. Impacts related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be **potentially significant.**

c. The nearest school, Calabash Street Elementary School, is located approximately 0.5 miles to the east. This school would not be affected by any emissions, materials, substances or waste from the project. **No impact** would occur.

d. The nearest listed contaminated site is the Motion Picture and Television Hospital located beyond El Canon Avenue approximately 70 feet to the east-northeast. This offsite property reported a release of gasoline from an underground tank in 1986. The case was issued closure in 1998. The depth to groundwater is approximately 10 feet below ground surface. Regional groundwater flow is towards the northeast. It is considered unlikely that the groundwater beneath the project site is adversely affected from the offsite property **No impact** would occur.

e, f. The project site is not in the vicinity of an airstrip. The closest airport is the Van Nuys Airport, located approximately 10 miles northeast of the site. **No impact** would occur.

g. The proposed residential development would not interfere with an emergency response/evacuation plan. **No impact** would occur.

h. The entire City of Calabasas is located in Fire Zone IV, which is characterized by watershed lands that contain native growth and vegetation (City of Calabasas General Plan, Community Profile, 1993). However, the project site is not within 500 feet of native vegetation and is within the 5-minute emergency response time; therefore, impacts related to wildland fire would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

The following measures are required to mitigate potential impacts relating to the release of asbestos and lead during building demolition.

HAZ-1 **Asbestos Removal.** When work is performed in the vicinity of ACM, the workers shall be informed that the materials contain asbestos. Removal of ACM shall be performed by a licensed (Contractor's State License Board) and registered (Cal/OSHA) asbestos abatement contractor under the supervision of a Cal/OSHA certified Asbestos Consultant and asbestos shall be removed and disposed of in compliance with applicable State laws. Regardless of whether asbestos is identified in the building, prior to demolition of the existing structure, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) shall be notified and an SCAQMD Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Compliance Checklist shall be submitted to both SCAQMD and the City of Calabasas.

HAZ-2 **Lead Removal.** Workers shall utilize respiratory protection during the removal of lead-based paint until air monitoring results indicate that worker exposure is below the Federal OSHA Action Level of 30 $\mu g/m^3$. Due to the amount of lead encountered, additional analysis, such as a California Wet-Test, shall be performed prior to disposal to determine disposal options.

Significance After Mitigation

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts related to the release/exposure of asbestos containing material and lead based paint would be reduced to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering or the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	■	☐
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	■
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	■
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	■
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	■

Hydrology and Hydraulic Studies were prepared for the site by JSA, and dated September 21, 2007 and May 11, 2007 respectively. The studies were used in part for analysis of the project's impacts related to Hydrology and Water Quality. The reports are contained in Appendix E.

a. Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act. Calabasas is within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure that stormwater generated by a development does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards. Section 402 of the Clean Water Act ensures compliance with the SQMP. Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, and are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP. In accordance with the Countywide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. Since the proposed project involves the construction of between 10 and 99 housing units, a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would be required. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Calabasas has adopted a City Runoff Mitigation Plan (RMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. The City's RMP ordinance requires new developments to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. This ordinance also requires new developments to submit a plan to the City Engineer that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's RMP and identifies the project-specific BMPs that will be implemented. Compliance with standard City and County requirements would reduce impacts to surface water quality to a **less than significant level.**

b. At buildout of the proposed project, impervious surfaces would cover approximately 30,814 square feet, or about 78% of the net site area, leaving the remaining 22% of the site with pervious ground cover. Chapter 17.56.030 of the City of Calabasas Municipal Code requires that at least 28% of site coverage be pervious for new development in the Commercial Old Town zone. However, in accordance with State Bill 1818, the applicant is requesting that the City approve the reduced pervious surface area The proposed project would not adversely

affect groundwater recharge as the City of Calabasas does not contain any groundwater recharge areas (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR 1995). Impacts to groundwater recharge would be **less than significant.**

c,d. Existing onsite runoff flows into the Calabasas Creek, which eventually empties into the Pacific Ocean. Upon completion of the proposed project, runoff would continue to flow into the Calabasas Creek. The City of Calabasas requires that new development does not increase runoff over existing onsite flows. JSA determined that, although there would be an increase in impervious surface area as a result of the proposed project, there would be adequate onsite storage so that proposed project would not cause an increase in the volume of runoff. Development of the proposed subterranean garage may require temporary or permanent dewatering of ground water; treatment and discharge of this water would be subject to the requirements of the NPDES permit and regulated by the RWQCB. The proposed project would be subject to the requirements of the Los Angeles County Stormwater Ordinance and the City's RMP ordinance. Because the proposed project would contribute to increased runoff and hazards of potential flooding through proposed site development, increased onsite impervious surface, and potential dewatering activities, impacts would be **potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.**

e. As discussed above, the proposed project would increase the amount of onsite impervious surface area. As such, an increase in pollutant loads is likely to occur. Grading activities would be subject to the City's RMP ordinance and implementation of standard erosion control BMPs, as described in Calabasas Municipal Code Chapter 17.54, would reduce water quality impacts. Calabasas/McCoy Creek is one of the headwater of the Los Angeles River. The owners shall be responsible to meet all safety requirements and EPA approved measures to keep the water clean. All Total Maximum Daily loads (TMDL) applicable to Los Angeles River are applicable to McCoy/Calabasas Creek and thus a responsibility of the property owner(s). The design must consider all TMDLs applicable to the area to ensure the site would not exceed targets adopted by the EPA or State Water Resource Control Board. Adherence to all applicable regulations and requirements would reduce impacts to water quality to the maximum extent practicable and impacts would be **less than significant.**

f. The proposed project would not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. Compliance with standard City and County requirements would reduce impacts to surface water quality to **a less than significant level.**

g-i. Although the project site is located adjacent to Calabasas Creek, it is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 1995). A report prepared by JSA (May 11, 2007) identified the project site as potentially subject to shallow flooding (depths of less than one foot) from the adjacent McCoy/Calabasas Creek during 50-year storm flows. Therefore impacts from flood hazards and risks associated with flood would be **potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.**

j. Inundation by a seiche, tsunami or mudflow is not expected to occur, as there are no major bodies of water in the vicinity of the project site and project site is generally flat. **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures

The following measures are required to mitigate potential impacts relating to increased surface runoff, potential downstream flooding, and onsite flood hazards.

HWQ-1 **Rain Gutters.** Install rain gutters and orient them towards permeable surfaces rather than driveways or non-permeable surfaces so that runoff would penetrate into the ground instead of flowing off-site.

HWQ-2 **Grades.** Modify grades of property to divert flow to permeable areas and to minimize the amount of storm water leaving the property.

HWQ-3 **Sediment Traps.** Use sediment traps to intercept runoff from drainage areas and hold or slowly release the runoff, with sediments held in the trap for later removal.

HWQ-4 **Retention.** Use retention structures or design rooftops to store runoff. Utilize subsurface areas for storm runoff either for reuse or to enable release of runoff at predetermined times or rates to minimize the peak discharge into storm drains. Cisterns are also a possible storage mechanism for reuse.

HWQ-5 **Site Design.** Design curbs, berms or the like so as to avoid isolation of permeable or landscaped areas. Implement the use of pervious asphalt, grassy swales and berms near the creek to the maximum extent feasible.

HWQ-6 **Structural Design.** Elevation of the lowest habitable floor shall be situated above levels of potential shallow flooding during 50-year storm flows. Floodproofing shall be incorporated into the design of the subterranean garage which shall be submitted to City engineer for review and approval.

Significance After Mitigation

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts related to the increased surface runoff, downstream flooding, and onsite flood hazard would be reduced to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	■
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to				

the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. Currently, the project site is developed with one abandoned primary residential structure and two accessory structures which appear to have been secondary residential structures, or guest houses, as well as a few storage/shed structures. The remainder of the site is generally covered with vegetation, a driveway, an empty above ground pool, and some fencing. Project development would include the construction of two, three-story buildings containing 75 units of affordable senior housing. The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. **No impact** would occur.

b. The project site is zoned Commercial, Old Town (CT) and designated as Business - Old Town (B-OT) (City of Calabasas General Plan, 1993). The proposed affordable housing complex is an allowed use within the CT zone. **No impact** would occur.

c. The proposed project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan as the project site is not located in an area where these plans exist. **No impact** would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	■	☐

a-b. The project site is located in an area classified as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3) (City of Calabasas General Plan, 1993). MRZ-3 areas contain mineral deposits for which the significance cannot be evaluated from available data and are not protected by the City or the State (City of Calabasas General Plan, 1993). The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource of local, regional, or statewide importance. Impacts to mineral resources would be **less than significant.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. Noise levels associated with existing and future traffic along El Canon Avenue were calculated using the Caltrans California Vehicle Noise Emission Levels (CALVENO) and standard noise modeling equations adapted from the Federal Highway Administration noise prediction model (Noise Modeling Data sheets can be viewed in Appendix F of this document). For traffic-related noise, impacts are considered significant if project-generated traffic results in exposure of sensitive receptors to unacceptable noise levels. The Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) recommendations were used to determine whether or not increases in roadway noise would be considered significant. Table 5 shows the significance thresholds for increases in traffic related noise levels caused either by the project alone or by cumulative development.

Table 5
Significance of Changes in
Operational Roadway Noise Exposure

Ambient Noise Level Without Project (Ldn or CNEL)	Significant Impact
< 60 dB	+ 5.0 dB or more
60 – 65 dB	+ 3.0 dB or more
> 65 dB	+ 1.5 dB or more

Source: Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON), August 1993

The proposed 75-unit senior housing complex would generate an estimated 261 average daily vehicle trips (see section XV, *Transportation / Traffic*). The estimated project generated traffic would result in an increase of approximately 0.4 dBA CNEL from 58.6 dBA existing to 59.0 dBA with project-added traffic (see Appendix F for model results). Therefore, the noise level increase associated with project-generated traffic would not be significant.

The project site is located adjacent to a Las Virgenes Municipal Water District sewage lift pump station. The pump station operates one to three pumps depending on the flow volume and is the primary noise source in the project area. Two weekday 20-minute noise measurements were taken using an ANSI Type II integrating sound level meter onsite on October 3, 2007. One measurement was taken while two pumps were running (average) to capture the average ambient noise levels onsite. The measurement result indicated an average ambient noise level onsite of 60 dBA (see Appendix F for measurement results), which is within the 50 to 65 dBA normally acceptable range for multi-family residential development identified in the Calabasas General Plan (1993). The second measurement was taken with the pump house doors open and the auxiliary generator running in order to capture the maximum noise level generated by the pump house. The auxiliary generator is only run during power outages, and operates on a time delay to fire up when power is out for two to five minutes. On average, rolling "brown outs" or "black outs" result in power outages about once a month during the summer season (John Stangle, personal communication, 2007). Thus, noise levels associated with the auxiliary generator are intermittent in nature and generally occur only 3-8 times during the summer season. The maximum noise level measured while the auxiliary generator was running with the doors open was 85.1 dBA (see Appendix F for measurement results). Therefore, residents of the proposed project would be subject to intermittent noise levels exceeding the acceptable thresholds identified in the Calabasas General Plan. However, as discussed above, the levels are only reached during power outages which generally occur during summer time, and would not result in prolonged exposure to noise levels exceeding thresholds identified in the General Plan. Therefore impacts related to noise level exposure would be less than significant.

b. Construction of the proposed project would entail site grading, clearing, and building activities. Construction-related activities associated with the project have the potential to create temporary noise and groundborne vibration in the immediate vicinity for adjacent residences, which are considered sensitive receptors. Typical noise levels associated with the use of heavy equipment at construction sites can range from about 78 to 88 dBA at 50 feet from the source, depending upon the types of equipment in operation at any given time and phase of construction (USEPA, 1971). The closest residences are about 20 feet from the project site where

maximum construction-related noise levels could exceed 88 dBA, exceeding the 65 dBA normally acceptable and the 70 dBA conditionally acceptable for multi-family residences as identified in the land compatibility matrix with the City of Calabasas General Plan (Community Profile, 1993). The Motion Picture and Television Hospital located across El Canon Ave from the project site is approximately 45 feet from the site and thus would be subject to construction noise levels below those experienced by the adjacent residences. However, construction-related impacts are considered **less than significant** because they are temporary in nature. Mitigation Measure N-1 would further reduce impacts from construction noise

c. Please see discussion under item a.

d. Please see discussion under item b.

e, f. The proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels generated by air traffic as there is no airport or private airstrip in the City of Calabasas. The closest airport is the Van Nuys Airport, located approximately 10 miles northeast of the project site. **No impact** would occur.

Mitigation Measures

Although construction impacts would not be significant due to their temporary nature, the following measures are recommended to minimize construction impacts at night, when people are more sensitive to noise and to reduce daytime construction noise to the extent feasible.

N-1 **Hours of Construction Activity**. Construction activity for site preparation and development shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction shall occur on State holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities, such as interior painting, are not subject to these restrictions.

N-2 **Stationary Construction Equipment.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noise which exceeds 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded and located as far away from residences and other noise sensitive uses to the maximum extent feasible.

Significance after Mitigation

Although construction related noise impacts would be less than significant, the mitigation measures listed above would further reduce impacts.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	■

a. The proposed project involves the construction of 75 affordable housing units for seniors on a parcel that is zoned Commercial, Old Town (CT) (City of Calabasas General Plan, 1993). The project would not require substantial infrastructure improvements as the site has been previously developed and existing development surrounds the project site. The proposed project would not generate new permanent employment opportunities that would induce population growth. It is expected that the proposed affordable senior housing development would serve the City's existing population and would not draw a substantial number of people to move to Calabasas. Impacts related to population growth would be **less than significant.**

b-c. An abandoned single-family residence and support structures currently occupy the project site. The proposed project would displace one housing unit, but would result in a net increase of 74 units. It would not displace any people. **No impact** would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i) Fire protection?	☐	☐	■	☐
ii) Police protection?	☐	☐	■	☐
iii) Schools?	☐	☐	■	☐
iv) Parks?	☐	☐	■	☐
v) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	■	☐

a (i). The closest fire station to the project site is Station #68 which is located at 24130 Calabasas Road. Station #68 is part of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. An increase in population would incrementally increase demand for fire services. However, the proposed project is not expected to cause a strain on existing fire protection service and improvements to fire protection infrastructure would not be required. Impacts to fire protection service would be **less than significant.**

a (ii). The Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department provides police service to residents of Calabasas. An increase in population would incrementally increase demand for police service. However, the proposed affordable senior housing development would not cause a strain on the Los Angeles County Sheriffs Department service and improvements to police protection infrastructure would not be required. Impacts to police protection service would be **less than significant.**

a (iii). The proposed project involves the development of 75 affordable senior housing units. As senior citizens generally do not have school-aged children, the project would not directly or indirectly generate a substantial increase in new students in the area, result in any adverse physical impacts, or impede performance objectives for any of local schools. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

a (iv). The proposed project involves the development of 75 affordable senior housing units and would include 21,304 sf of open space onsite. Calabasas Creek Park is located approximately 0.11 miles northwest of the project site and Alizondo Drive Park is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. The proposed project is expected to serve the City's existing

population and would not induce substantial growth in the project area. The project would not directly affect any existing parks or impede performance objectives for any of local parks. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

a (v). The proposed project is not expected to have a significant impact on any other public facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION —				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	■	☐

a. The proposed project involves the development of 75 affordable senior housing units. Calabasas Creek Park is located approximately 0.11 miles northwest of the project site and Alizondo Drive Park is located approximately 1.5 miles southeast of the project site. As the proposed project is expected to serve the City's existing population, the project is not expected to induce substantial growth in the project area. As such, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly affect existing neighborhood or regional parks/recreation facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

b. Project development would incrementally increase demand for park space in the area. However, as discussed above, parks are present in the area. The construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities would not be warranted. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC — Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	■	☐	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	■	☐	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	■
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g. farm equipment)?	☐	☐	■	☐
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	■	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	■	☐

The following traffic analysis is based upon a traffic study conducted by Kunzman Associates and dated September 14, 2007, which is attached to this document as Appendix G.

Regional access to the project site is provided primarily by the Ventura Freeway (U.S. 101). The nearest access to U.S. 101 is via the northbound on- and off-ramps at Long Valley Road and the southbound on- and off-ramps at Calabasas Road, which are approximately 800 feet and 1,500 feet northeast of the project site, respectively. Study area roadways that would be utilized by travelers to and from the proposed project include Calabasas Road to the north and El Canon Road to the west.

a, b. The traffic study examined the intersection of Calabasas Road and El Canon Road.

Current Levels of Service. Level of service (LOS) is a qualitative measure used to describe the condition of traffic flow, ranging from excellent conditions at LOS A to overloaded conditions at

LOS F. LOS D is typically recognized as the minimum acceptable level of service in urban areas. The analyzed intersection is stop-controlled (unsignalized).

The technique used to assess the capacity needs of an unsignalized intersection is known as the Intersection Delay Method. To calculate delay, the volume of traffic using the intersection is compared with the capacity of the intersection.

The delay during the peak hour for the existing traffic conditions have been calculated and are shown in Table 6. Existing delays are based upon manual monitoring of evening peak hour intersections movements made for Kunzman Associates in July 2007. Figures 5 and 6 of the traffic study show morning and evening peak hour traffic turning movement volumes.

Table 6
Existing Levels of Service

	Intersection	Peak Hour	Existing Conditions	
			Delay*	LOS
1	El Canon Avenue & Calabasas Road	AM	20 3	C
		PM	50 8	F

** Average stopped delay per vehicle in seconds*
Source: Kunzman Associates, 2007

As indicated in Table 5, the study area intersection currently operates at a LOS C during the morning peak hour and an LOS F during the evening peak hour.

Significance Thresholds. The City of Calabasas has adopted a level of service threshold of LOS C (V/C ratio 0.80) or better as the minimum standard for intersection operations. Projects that degrade roadways and/or intersections below LOS C must provide measures to mitigate their impacts. Significant transportation impacts are determined based on the criteria shown in Table 7.

Table 7
City of Calabasas Traffic Impact Standards

Allowable Project Related Traffic Increases Where Intersection Performance Standards Are or Will Be Exceeded (Urban Areas)		
Existing or Future	**V/C**	**Maximum Peak Hour Increase**
LOS D	0 81-0.90	0 0100
LOS E	0 91-1.00	0 0060
LOS F	>1 00	0 0030

Table 7
City of Calabasas Traffic Impact Standards

Allowable Project Related Traffic Increases Where Intersection Performance Standards Are or Will Be Exceeded (Urban Areas)		
Existing or Future	**V/C**	**Maximum Peak Hour Increase**

Source: City of Calabasas General Plan, Transportation Element

Project Trip Generation. The trip generation estimates for the proposed project were prepared using trip generation rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers' *Trip Generation, 7th Edition.*

Table 8 presents the trip generation rates and estimates for the proposed project. Figure 7 of the traffic study shows the distribution of project generated traffic and Figure 8 of the traffic study shows the traffic volumes added by the proposed project at the analyzed intersection.

Table 8
Trip Generation Rates and Estimates

Land Use	Rate/Size	Daily	Weekday AM Peak Hour			Weekday PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Trip Generation Rates								
Senior Attached Housing	Dwelling unit	3.48	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.04	0.11
Trip Generation Estimates								
Senior Attached Housing	Dwelling unit	261	3	3	6	5	3	8
Net New Trips		**261**	**3**	**3**	**6**	**5**	**3**	**8**

Sources: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Trip Generation, Seventh Edition, 2003, Kunzman Associates, 2007.

The proposed 75-unit affordable senior housing project would generate an estimated 261 daily vehicle trips, including 6 weekday AM peak hour and 8 weekday PM peak hour trips.

Cumulative Base Intersection Traffic Conditions. Table 9 summarizes the future level of service at the El Canon Avenue/Calabasas Road intersection in 2009 with and without project-generated traffic. The intersection is projected to operate at LOS C during the weekday AM peak period and LOS F during the PM peak periods in year 2009 without the proposed project (Cumulative Base condition).

Table 9
Intersection Levels of Service Future Conditions (Year 2009)

Intersection	Peak Hour	Cumulative Base		Cumulative + Project		Delay Increase
		Delay*	LOS	Delay*	LOS	
El Canon Avenue & Calabasas Road	AM	24 5	C	26 1	D	1 6
	PM	90 9	F	99 9	F	9 0

** Average stopped delay per vehicle, in seconds*
Source. Kunzman Associates, 2007

Project Impacts. Table 9 summarizes the future levels of service with project-generated traffic (Cumulative + Project) and compares these service levels to the baseline (Cumulative Base) condition. Project-generated traffic would increase the delay during the AM peak hour by an estimated 1.6 seconds and would increase the delay during the PM peak hour by an estimated 9.0 seconds. Figures 21 and 22 of the traffic study show the cumulative base traffic volumes at the study intersection and Figures 23 and 24 of the traffic study show the cumulative base plus project traffic volumes at the study intersection.

As shown in Table 10, the project-generated traffic would account for an estimated 3.1% of the cumulative plus project added traffic at the intersection. Using the City of Calabasas's significance criteria (see Table 7), the results indicate that traffic generated by the proposed project would have a significant impact to the intersection of El Canon Avenue and Calabasas Road because the 3.1% increase in traffic exceeds the 0.003 V/C threshold. Therefore impacts would be **potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.**

Table 10
Project Traffic Contribution

Intersection	Existing Traffic	Existing + Cumulative + Project	Project Traffic	% Increase From Project*
El Canon Avenue & Calabasas Road	2,500	2,759	8	3.1%

**Based on the increase over existing traffic volume as a result of cumulative + project traffic*
Source. City of Calabasas General Plan, Transportation Element

c. The proposed project involves the development of a two, three-story buildings with 75 affordable housing units for seniors The proposed structure would be similar in height to surrounding structures The project would not affect air traffic or result in a change of air traffic patterns, or otherwise include a change in air traffic locations that would result in a substantial safety risk. **No impact** would occur.

d. The proposed project involves the construction of affordable senior housings in an urbanized part of Calabasas. The proposed housing development would be compatible with surrounding

land uses and would not increase circulation hazards. Therefore, impacts relating to onsite circulation hazards would be **less than significant.**

e. The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access as the Fire Department would review site plans, site construction, and the actual structures prior to occupancy. As part of the review, the Fire Department would ensure that required fire protection safety features, including adequate emergency access, are implemented. Impacts to emergency access would be **less than significant.**

f. The proposed subterranean parking garage would provide 76 parking spaces (74 standard spaces, two handicapped spaces, including one van accessible space, and 83 bicycle spaces). Figure 7 shows the proposed parking garage. The California State Planning and Zoning Law, Chapter 4.3, Section 65915(p) establishes the maximum required parking spaces for affordable projects. As shown in Table 11, the 76 proposed parking spaces would meet the State parking requirement for affordable housing projects. However, current garage design could result in visibility hazards during ingress and egress. Therefore, parking-related impacts would be **potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated.**

Table 11
Parking Requirements for Affordable Housing Projects

No. of Bedrooms	Quantity	Requirement	Required Parking
0-1	74 bedrooms	1 space/room	74
2	1 bedroom	2 spaces/room	2
		Total	**76**

Note: Parking requirements based on the California State Planning and Zoning Law, Chapter 4 3, Section 65915(p)

g. The project site is in an area that is well-served by local and regional transit. It is also within walking distance of a variety of services that site residents may utilize. The proposed project would not conflict with any programs, policies or plans supporting alternative transportation. Impacts would be **less than significant.**

Mitigation Measures

The following measures would reduce traffic-related impacts to a less than significant level.

T-1 **Intersection Improvement.** "Keep Clear" shall be painted in the eastbound lane of Calabasas Road at the intersection of El Canon Avenue so that the northbound left turn can be made from El Canon Avenue

T-2 **Traffic Analysis/Traffic Signal.** Approximately one year after project occupancy, a traffic analysis shall be performed to determine whether the

Calabasas Road/ El Canon Avenue intersection is functioning at an acceptable level of service. If the traffic analysis determines that the level of service is unacceptable, a traffic signal shall be installed. The project applicant shall contribute a fair share toward funding of this traffic signal.

T-3 **Registered Traffic Engineer Consideration.** Have a registered traffic engineer consider the following safety issues and propose solutions that will be fair yet effective:

- The current design has the driveway ingress aligned with the internal egress movement. This exposes a potential for head on collisions at the transition.
- The northern driveway wall into the substructure will block the visibility of vehicles maneuvering within the parking spaces immediately to the north. Cars exiting this area will not be visible to entering vehicles.
- Since the parking structure is subterranean, visibility upon ingress during daylight hours will decrease unless the transition area is well lit.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 through T-3 would reduce traffic and transportation related impacts to a less than significant level.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	■	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements	☐	■	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project: needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	■	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	■	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	■	☐

a, b. The proposed project involves construction of 75 attached, affordable senior housing units. Wastewater generated by the City of Calabasas is treated at the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility, operated by Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). The Tapia Water Reclamation Facility has a capacity of 16 million gallons per day (mgd) and treats an average of 9.5 mgd (LVMWD, 2005). Therefore, there is a surplus capacity of 6.5 mgd. According to the Calabasas General Plan FEIR, the wastewater generation factor for a multi-family residential unit is 260 gallons per day. Based on this generation factor, the proposed project would generate approximately 19,500 gallons per day or 0.0195 mgd (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR, 1995). Wastewater generated by the proposed project would account for approximately 0.3% of the Tapia Water Reclamation Facility's surplus treatment capacity. Therefore, no expansion of the Reclamation Facility would be needed and impacts to wastewater treatment systems would be **less than significant.**

c. Project development would decrease onsite pervious surface area from the current 38,671 sf to an estimated 11,362 sf. At buildout of the project, approximately 22% of the project site would be pervious. Chapter 17.56.030 of the City of Calabasas Municipal Code requires that at least 28% of site coverage be pervious for new development in the Commercial Old Town zone. However, the applicant is requesting exceptions to the code in accordance with State Bill 1818, including a reduced percentage of pervious area onsite. As discussed under Section VIII e., *Hydrology and Water Quality*, inflow into the SUSMP filter box would be restricted to the maximum pre-project flow to limit the outflow from the project site to the pre-project amount. Therefore, the proposed development would not result in an increase of offsite stormwater flow requiring new or expanded stormwater drainage or treatment facilities. Furthermore, implementation of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Stormwater Ordinance, the NPDES permit, and the City's RMP (Runoff Mitigation Plan) ordinance would reduce impacts to a **less than significant** level.

d. The multi-family residential development water use factor is 436 gallons per day (gpd) per residential unit (City of Calabasas General Plan FEIR 1995). Therefore, the proposed project would increase water demand by approximately 32,700 gpd.

The City of Calabasas obtains water service from the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District (LVMWD). According to the LVMWD's 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, LVMWD estimates their water supply in 2010 to be approximately 36,590 acre feet per year (approximately 100 acre feet per day). The proposed project would result in an increase in water demand of approximately 0.01 acre feet per day. Thus, the project demand would represent 0.01% of estimated water supply. The project's anticipated water demand would not result in a significant impact to the water supply of the City of Calabasas. However, because the project does not incorporate the City's water conservation performance objectives, impacts to water conservation are considered **potentially significant.**

e. Please see discussion under items a and b.

f, g. The Calabasas Landfill, located adjacent to the Ventura Freeway on Lost Hills Road, would receive the solid waste generated by the proposed project. The total capacity of the Calabasas Landfill is 29.9 million tons and its remaining capacity is 8 million tons. Currently the Calabasas Landfill has a daily capacity of 3,500 tons/day and the average daily intake is 1,800 tons/day (CIWMB). Therefore, there are about 1,700 tons/day of available capacity. Based on current intake rates, the Calabasas Landfill is expected to reach capacity in 2028. An increase in the population of the City of Calabasas would incrementally reduce the available capacity at the Calabasas Landfill. However, the solid waste generated by the proposed multi-family residence would result in an estimated 0.45 tons/day (City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide 12.23 lb/household/day), which is less than 0.03% of the remaining daily capacity. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable provisions of the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element, including providing recycling and waste storage areas in order to achieve 50% diversion of solid waste, preventing recyclable materials from entering the landfill. Thus, solid waste generation from the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact on the permitted remaining capacity of the Calabasas Landfill.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to water conservation to a less than significant level.

U-1 **Water Conservation Techniques.** In order to meet the City's water conservation performance objectives, the following techniques shall be included:

- *Incorporation of drought tolerant and low water using plants; maximize preservation of natural vegetation.*
- *Incorporation of water conservation techniques into the design of the irrigation system through such techniques as mulching, installation of drip irrigation systems, landscape design to group plants of similar water demand, rain sensors and automatic irrigation systems.*

- *Clustering of landscaped areas to maximize the efficiency of the irrigation system; design of irrigation systems to eliminate watering of impervious surfaces.*
- *Installation of water conserving kitchen and bathroom fixtures and appliances, installation of thermostatically controlled mixing valves for baths and showers, and insulation of hot water circulating systems.*

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of the above mitigation measure would ensure impacts related to water use and conservation would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	■	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	■	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	■	☐

a. The proposed project would not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The proposed project has the potential to adversely affect as-yet undiscovered cultural resources

and human remains if they are found to exist within the project area. The proposed project would result in impacts to protected native oak trees through the removal or six protected coast live oaks. These impacts are reduced to a less than significant level through incorporation of mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-2, and BIO-1 through BIO-13. Please refer to *Biological Resources* and *Cultural Resources* sections of this document for additional information that supports this finding.

b. The proposed project involves the construction of 75 units of affordable senior housing in the City of Calabasas. Impacts related to the development of the proposed project would be mitigated to a less than significant level through the implementation of mitigation measures contained in this document. As such, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

c. The proposed project has significant but mitigable environmental effects associated with geology and hazards, as discussed in Sections VI and VII, respectively. These effects can be mitigated to levels of insignificance through incorporation of mitigation measures GEO-1, HAZ-1 and HAZ-2. Refer to the discussions under each of these sections for additional information that supports this finding. No significant residual effects would occur after implementing the recommended mitigation.

References

Bass, Ronald E., Herson, Albert I., Bogdan, Kenneth M, (ed.), *CEQA Deskbook*, 1999.

Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, *Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances*, prepared for the US EPA, 1971.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Waste Generation Rates, http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/default.htm, accessed online 2007.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Waste Stream Profiles, http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Profiles/, accessed online 2007.

City of Calabasas, General Plan, May 1993.

City of Calabasas, General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, September 6, 1995.

City of Calabasas, Official Website, http://www.cityofcalabasas.com, accessed online September and October 2007.

City of Calabasas, Land Use & Development Code, adopted July 1, 1998, amended through Ordinance 2006-231.

City of Calabasas, Municipal Code, http://www.bpcnet.com/codes/calabasas/ , accessed online September and October 2007.

City of Calabasas, Old Town Calabasas Master Plan and Design Guidelines, March 16, 1994.

Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 7th Edition, 2003.

Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, 2005 Urban Water Management Plan.

Patrick Nichols, Rincon Consultants Site Visit, October 2007.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/hdbk.html accessed online October 26, 2006

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/AQMD03AQMP.htm, accessed October 2, 2007.

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2007 Draft Air Quality Management Plan, http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/07aqmp/07AQMP.html, accessed October 2, 2007.

Southern California Association of Governments, Growth Forecasting, http://www.scag.ca.gov/forecast/index.htm, accessed online October 4, 2007.